

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4, 7-14, 17-21, 40-47 and 57-61 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 12, 40 and 57 are independent claims. Claim 3, 5-6 and 15-17 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 22-39 and 48-56 are currently cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 57-61 are added. No new matter has been added which would require further search. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection

Entry of the Amendment is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of final rejected claims; and/or c) places the application in better form for an appeal, if an appeal is necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-26, 28, 30-35, 37, 39-52, 54 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0112789 to Heinonen et al. (hereinafter “Heinonen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,232 to Hasty, Jr. et al. (hereinafter “Hasty”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,380 to Norefors et al. (hereinafter “Norefors”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the combination of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors does not teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in the pending claims, and newly added claims 57-61. Independent of claims 1 and 40, in part, recite “the code and the wide area identification are to be coupled into a hashed code for proximity identification of the mobile device, and wherein the hashed code is to be transmitted to the mobile device along with an instruction to forward the hashed code to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device.”

Independent claims 12 and 57, in part, recite “coupling the first and second identifications in a hashed code as a proximity identification of the mobile device; and transmitting a message

to the mobile device including the hashed code and instructing the mobile device to forward the message to the server for associating the first identification with the second identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device.” Heinonen does not teach or suggest these features.

The Office Action acknowledged that the combination of Heinonen and Hasty does not teach or suggest that “the hashed code is to be transmitted to the mobile device along with an instruction to forward the hashed code to the network server to associate the code and the wide area identification in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device.” But, the Office Action cited Norefors to cure this deficiency.

Norefors also does not cure any of the deficiencies of Heinonen or Hasty. The cited section of Norefors merely discloses that a message, including an encrypted security token and hash code, is transmitted to a mobile node where it is deciphered and re-encrypted with another encryption key. The second encryption key is shared by the mobile node and a second access point. The re-encrypted message is sent from the mobile node to the second access point where it is deciphered using the shared encryption key. A communications link is established between the mobile node and the second access point to achieve a secure handover, if the second access point authenticates the mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. See at least Col. 2, lines 17-37 of Norefors.

In the Response to Argument section, the Office Action alleged that the handover request to the second access point in Norefors reads on the subsequent service, as recited in the pending claims. In Norefors, handover from one access point to another access point occurs if the second access point authenticates the mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. There is no teaching or suggestion in Norefors of associating the content of the hash code “(the code and the wide area identification) in a subsequent request for service by the mobile device,” as recited in the pending claims. As is known to one skilled in the art, handover or handoff, as discussed in Norefors, is the transition of the mobile node from one access point or base station to another access point or base station as the mobile node moves around. Handover is performed to prevent call termination as the mobile node moves around.

Norefors discloses that a communications link is established between the mobile node and the second access point to achieve a secure handover, if the second access point authenticates the

mobile node based on the deciphered security token and hash code. Thus, Norefors appears to suggest that the communication link is established for a current handover of the mobile node. Nevertheless, even if the communication link in Norefors is established for a later handover of the mobile node, there is no teaching or suggestion in Norefors, that subsequent handover of the mobile node is associated with the deciphered security token and hash code. Instead, based on the teachings of Norefors, if the communication link is established for a subsequent handover of the mobile node, the link is used for the subsequent handover of the mobile node, without a need for further authentication.

Therefore, the combination of Heinonen, Hasty and Norefors fails to teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 1, 12, 40 and 57. Each of pending claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-21, 41-47 and 58-61 depends on claims 1, 12, 40 and 57, and therefore, incorporates all of the elements of claims 1, 12, 40 and 57 in addition to the further limitations recited in claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-21, 41-47 and 58-61. Hence, pending claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-21, 41-47 and 58-61 are also allowable at least because of their dependence on claims 1, 12, 40 and 57. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8-14, 17-26, 28, 30-35, 37, 39-52, 54 and 56 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Claims 27, 36 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen and Hasty in view of Norefors, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0046184 to Bjorklund et al. (hereinafter “Bjorklund”). Claims 29, 38 and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinonen and Hasty in view of Norefors, and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0127204 to Belmont (hereinafter “Belmont”). Claims 27, 29, 36, 38, 53, and 55 have been cancelled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 27, 29, 36, 38, 53, and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Disclaimer

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-00449-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: April 20, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Arlene Neal/

Arlene Neal

Registration No.: 43,828

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1875 Eye Street, NW

Suite 1100

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 331-7111

(202) 293-6229 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant